

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

<del>.</del> .	المراجع المناج المناج	the state of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of		The second second	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,998	03/30/2004	Ruey J. Yu	59210.000052	2680	
21967 7590 04/02/2007 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			EXAM	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W.			SCHLIENTZ,	SCHLIENTZ, NATHAN W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1109		1616		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		04/02/2007	PAPER		

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/811,998	YU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nathan W. Schlientz	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Oc</u>	ctober 2006					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	action is non-final.					
	, <del>_</del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)⊠ Claim(s) 111-162 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> </ul>						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 111-162 are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	or organization.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

The examiner for your application in the USPTO has changed. Examiner Nathan Schlientz can be reached at 571-272-9924.

The Restriction Requirement mailed 29 September 2006 is moot in view of the Preliminary amendment filed 01 August 2006, which cancelled claims 1-110 and added new claims 111-162. However, upon further consideration of claims 111-162, the examiner has deemed a Restriction requirement is necessary for prosecution on the merits.

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 111-121, 149-154 and 159-161 drawn to a composition comprising an aldobionic acid, classified in class 514, subclass 54.
- II. Claims 122-140, 141-148, 155-158 and 162, drawn to a method for the general care, treatment or prevention of cosmetic conditions or dermatological disorders, including skin wounds, classified in class 424, subclasses 401 and 844.
- III. Claims 134-136, 138-140 and 146-148, drawn to a method for the general care, treatment or prevention of diseases or conditions of the oral, vaginal or anal mucosa, classified in classes 424, subclass 49 and 401; and class 514, subclasses 966 and 967.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Page 3

- 1. Inventions I and II-III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product, maltobionic acid, can be used to improve the taste of food (see U.S. Patent 3,829,583; Claims 1-6).
- 2. Inventions II and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have materially different design. The inventions of Groups II and III are materially different in design because the treatment of cosmetic conditions or dermatological conditions, such as wrinkles, is materially different from the treatment of conditions of the oral, vaginal, or anal mucosa, such as chronic gum disease of bleeding during tooth brushing. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required

Page 4

because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Notice of Possible Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

### Election of Species

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: topically active agents listed in Claims 115, 127, 140 and 144. The species are independent or distinct because they have different molecular structures, different physical and chemical properties, and materially different designs and modes of operation.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims 111, 113, 114, 115, 122, 125, 126, 127, 134, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143 and 144 are generic.

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the inorganic alkali listed in claims 117 and 129. The species are independent

Application/Control Number: 10/811,998

Art Unit: 1616

or distinct because they have different molecular structures, and different physical and chemical properties.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims 111, 116, 117, 122, 128 and 129 are generic.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the organic alkali listed in claims 118 and 131. The species are independent or distinct because they have different molecular structures, and different physical and chemical properties.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 111, 116, 118, 122, 128, 130 and 131 are generic.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: the amphoteric substances listed in claims 121 and 133. The species are independent or distinct because they have different molecular structures, and different physical and chemical properties.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 111, 116, 120, 121, 122, 128, 132 and 133 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Due to the complex nature of the instant restriction requirement, a written requirement was necessitated. See MPEP § 812.01.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan W. Schlientz whose telephone number is 571-272-9924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,998 Page 8

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan W. Schlientz, Ph.D. Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600 Group Art Unit 1616

Johann Richter, Ph.D., Esq. Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600 Group Art Unit 1616